# United States Patent and Trademark Office

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/804,467 | 03/18/2004 | Timothy E. Beres | 026125-000400US | 7245 |

67590    7590    08/31/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER, 8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| CAO, PHUONG THAO |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2164 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 08/31/2007 | PAPER |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 10/804,467 | BERES ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Phuong-Thao Cao | 2164 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 June 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.    2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *  c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This action is in response to Amendment filed on 6/26/2007.

2.      Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 13-17, 19-21, 31, 34, 35 and 42 have been amended. Currently,

claims 1-42 are pending.

### *Response to Amendment*

3.      Amendments to the Specification are effective to overcome the objection to the

Specification in the previous action. Therefore, the objection to the Specification has been

withdrawn.

4.      Amendments to claims are effective to overcome the 112 rejection but are not effective to

overcome the claim objections in the previous office action. Therefore, the 112 rejection has

been withdrawn, and the claim objections have been maintained.

### *Response to Arguments*

5.      Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-42 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Claim Objections*


6.      Claims 13-21 are objected to because of the following informalities: the following

indicated phases should be rewritten by adding some connecting word (i.e., "whether", "when",

"if", "which", etc.) to clarify the recited limitation.  For instance, regarding the phrase

"determining the one of the records is associated with a good stop document" (claim 13), it is

unclear whether the "determining the one of the records" or "the one of the records" is associated

with a good stop document.  The phrase should be rewritten as "determining **whether** the one of

the record is associated with a good stop document" or "determining the one of the record **which**

is associated with a good stop document", etc., depending on what Applicant intends to claim.


        Regarding claim 13, rewrite the phrase "determining the one of the records *is associated*

with a good stop document" (line 3).


        Regarding claim 14, rewrite the phrases "determining the one of the records *is associated*

with a good stop document" (line 1), "determining the one of the records *is associated* with a

deed document" (line 3) and "determining the records *include* a record associated with a

mortgage document linked to the deed" (line 5)


        Regarding claim 15, rewrite the phrases "determining the one of the records *is associated*

with a good stop document" (line 11 and 16) and "determining the one of the records *is*

*associated* with a deed document" (line 17).

Regarding claim 16, rewrite the phrases "determining the one of the records *is associated* with a good stop document" (line 1), "determining the one of the records *is associated* with a warranty deed" (line 3), "determining the records *include* a second record" (line 5) and "determining the records *do not include* a third deed record" (line 7).

Regarding claim 17, rewrite the phrases "determining the one of the records *is associated* with a good stop document" (line 1) and "determining the one of the records *is associated* with a government transfer deed" (line 2).

Regarding claim 18, rewrite the phrase "determining the records *do not include* a good stop record" (line 2).

Regarding claim 19, rewrite the phrases "determining the one of the records *is associated* with a lien document" (line 3) and "determining the records *do not include* a release record" (line 4).

Regarding claim 20, rewrite the phrase "determining the one of the records *is associated* with a document" (line 3).

Regarding claim 21, rewrite the phrase "determining the one of the records *does not include* a location attribute" (line 3).

Appropriate correction is required.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7.     The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

8.     Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (US

Publication No 2004/0024605, effective filing date 12/4/2002) in view of Ferguson et al. (US

Patent No 6,237,011 issued on 05/22/2001).

As to claim 1, Morris teaches:

"A computerized method for organizing and displaying documents for a title

examination" (see Morris, [0006], [0007], [0018]) the method comprising:

"receiving a plurality of records, each record having a plurality of attributes associated

with a document recorded with a government entity" (see Morris, [0012], [0018] and [0034]).

However, Morris does not teach:

"creating a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one of the records";

"displaying the records"; and

"displaying the created links between the records".

On the other hand, Ferguson et al. teaches:

"creating a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one of the records" (see Ferguson et al., [column 2, lines 15-25] and [column 8, lines 20-33]);

"displaying the records" (see Ferguson et al., [column 13, lines 32-35] for detailed list of documents);

"displaying the created links between the records" (see Ferguson et al., [column 8, lines 28-33]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ferguson et al. into Morris's system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Ferguson et al., Abstract and [column 8, lines 20-33] to display the results in the form of an organization hierarchy and thus provide an effective way to search and retrieve electronic documents. In addition, both of the references (Morris and Ferguson et al.) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, information retrieval and electronic data management. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

9.      Claims 1-14, 16-27 and 35-42 (effective filing date 3/18/2004) are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (US Publication No 2004/0024605, effective

filing date 12/4/2002) in view of Rush et al. (US Patent No 7,131,069, effective filing date

10/22/1998).

As to claim 1, Morris teaches:

"A computerized method for organizing and displaying documents for a title

examination" (see Morris, [0006], [0007], [0018]) the method comprising:

"receiving a plurality of records, each record having a plurality of attributes associated

with a document recorded with a government entity" (see Morris, [0012], [0018] and [0034]).

However, Morris does not teach:

"creating a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a

document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one

of the records";

"displaying the records"; and

"displaying the created links between the records".

On the other hand, Rush et al. teaches:

"creating a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a

document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one

of record" (see Rush et al., Abstract and [column 9, lines 5-10]);

"displaying the records" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1); and

"displaying the created links between the records (see Rush et al., Fig. 1 and [column 9, lines 5-10] and [column 12, lines 65-67]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Rush et al. into Morris's system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Rush et al., Abstract and [column 3, lines 44-67] to display a set of records in the form of an organization hierarchy and thus provide an effective way to search and retrieve electronic documents. In addition, both of the references (Morris and Rush et al.) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, information retrieval and electronic document management. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"creating an assignment link from a first record associated with a first document to a second record associated with a second document assigned to the first document" (see Rush et al., [column 3, lines 35-43] and [column 12, lines 65-67] wherein relationship between document and subdocument as disclosed is interpreted as Applicant's "assignment link").

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"creating a positive cure link from a first record associated with a lien document to a

second record associated a cure document that cures a lien represented by the lien document"

(see Morris, [0018] for relation between lien information and its release information; and Rush et

al., [column 8, lines 25-30] wherein relationship (linked by unique AP invoice identifier)

between Accounts Payable Invoice document (lien document) and Accounts Payable Payment

document (cure document) is interpreted as cure link).


As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"creating an probable cure link from a first record associated with a lien document to a

second record associated with a cure document, the cure document being a probable cure to a

lien represented by the lien document (see Morris, [0018] for lien document and other real estate

forms, and see Rush et al., [column 8, lines 25-30] and [column 17, lines 25-30] wherein

relationship (linked by unique AP invoice identifier) between Accounts Payable Invoice

document (charge) and Accounts Payable Payment document (payment) is interpreted as

probably cure link).


As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"creating a link from a first record associated with a first deed document to a second

record associated with a second deed document" (see Morris, [0004] and [0007] for liens, i.e.

deed documents, and see Rush et al., [column 9, line 5-10] for relationship (link) between

documents).


As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"creating a link from a first record associated with a first document to a second

document, wherein the second document amends the first document" (see Morris, [0004] for

relationship between liens, and Rush et al. for [column 7, lines 15-40] wherein the relationship

(link) between the Sale Order document and the Sales Order Item Release document as described

is equivalent to the link as illustrated in Applicant's claim language since the Sale Order Item

Release document amends release time information of the Sale Order document).


As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"creating a link from a first record associated with a first document to a second record

associated with a second document wherein the second document is a re-recordation of the first

document" (see Rush et al., [column 3, 35-40] wherein a sub document can be considered as re-

recordation of a document since sub document is disclosed as a portion of a document and appearing multiple times).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"creating a link from a first record associated with a deed document to a second record associated with a mortgage document" (see Morris, [0007] and [0017] for deed document and mortgage document; and see Rush et al., [column 12, lines 65-67] for creating links between documents).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"creating a link from a first document associated with a lien document to a second record associated with a release document partially releasing a lien represented by the lien document" (see Morris, [0018] for lien document and release documents; and see Rush et al., [column 11, lines 50-55] for generating links between documents).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"before displaying the records, creating a sentinel link from one of the records to an

indicator of an organizational property associated with the one of the records" (see Rush et al.,

[column 3, lines 45-67], [column 4, lines 15-30] and Fig. 7 wherein link between document

instance node (document or record) and document type node (organization property) in the

hierarchical tree structure is equivalent to Applicant's "sentinel link").


As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein creating the sentinel link comprises creating a link from the record to a

simulated record associated with a simulated document, the simulated document indicating the

organizational property" (see Rush et al., [column 3, lines 45-67], [column 4, lines 15-30] and

Fig. 7 wherein link between document instance node (document or record) and document type

node (organization property) in the hierarchical tree structure is equivalent to Applicant's

"sentinel link"; see Fig. 17 wherein the document type node "Customers" represents a simulated

document [column 4, lines 15-30] and record "Customers" represents a simulated record since

the document type node does not cause the display of information for a particular document).


As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein the records are received from search logic using an initial one of the records as a starting point for the search and wherein creating the sentinel link comprises creating a link from the initial record to a starting search indicator" (see Rush et al., [column 11, lines 35-67], [column 12, lines 1-25] and Fig. 7-8 wherein entry point is equivalent to Applicant's "starting point" and node "Customers" or "Sales Orders" are example of starting search indicator).

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"determining the one of the records is associated with a good stop document, the one of the records being a good stop for a title search" (see Rush et al., [column 11, lines 40-55] and [column 12, lines 1-10] for designating some documents as entry points);

"creating a link from the one of the records to a good stop indicator" (see Rush et al., Fig. 7 and Fig. 8 wherein each document type node represents a good stop indicator).

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"determining the record is associated with a deed document" (see Morris et al., [0006], [0007] and [0012] for a record of deed document)

"determining the records include a record associated with a mortgage document linked to

the deed document" (see Morris et al., [0007] for mortgage document and deed document; and

see Rush et al., [page 18, lines 5-25] for links between related documents).


As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"determining the record is associated with a warranty deed document having a first date"

(see Morris, [0005] and [0012] for settlement date);

"determining the records include a second record associated with a second deed

document having a second data later than the first date" (see Morris, [0018] wherein each record

includes a field for settlement date; also see [0048]); and

"determining the records do not including a third deed record having a date between the

first date and the second date" (see Morris, [0018] wherein each record includes a field for

settlement date, time information enables the determination of the temporal relation between

records; also see [0048]).


As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein determining the one of the records is associated with a good stop document comprises determining the one of the records is associated with a government transfer deed" (see Morris; [0007] and [0017] for deed documents).


As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"determining the records do not include a good stop record associated with a document being a good stop for a title search" (see Rush et al., [column 21, lines 20-30]);

"selecting a deed record from the records" (see Morris, [0017] and [0018]); and

"creating a link from the deed record to a no good stop indicator" (see Morris, [0017] and [0018] for records associated with deed documents; and see Rush et al., Abstract and [column 24, lines 25-65] for creation of expression).


As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"determining the one of the records is associated with a lien document" (see Morris, [0018] for records associated with lien documents);

"determining the record do not include a release record associated with a document that cures the lien" (see Morris, [0018] for tracking the release status of a lien); and

"creating a link from the record to a non-cured indicator" (see <u>Morris</u>, [0018] for tracking

the release status of a lien; and see <u>Rush et al.</u>, [column 24, lines 35-40] and [column 23, lines

32-38] for creating links from node (record) to POI icon wherein POI icon is interpreted as

indicator of interest).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

<u>Morris</u> and <u>Rush et al.</u> teach:

"determining the one of the records is associated with a document which may cloud

ownership of a property" (see <u>Rush et al.</u>, [column 24, lines 24-44]); and

"creating a link form the one of the records to a title cloud indicator" (see <u>Rush et al.</u>,

[column 25, 24-44] for creating POI expression).

As to claim 21, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

<u>Morris</u> and <u>Rush et al.</u> teach:

"determining the one of the records does not include a location attribute" (see <u>Rush et al.</u>,

[column 3, lines 45-65]); and

"creating a link from the record to a name indicator indicating the record is associated

with a name and not a location" (see <u>Rush et al.</u>, [column 3, lines 45-67]).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein displaying the records comprises displaying the records in an ordered list ordered by a record data attribute of the records, the displayed attributes of the records further including one or more of a reception number, a document type, a document category, a grantee name, and a grantor name" (see Fig. 1 and [column 23, lines 55-60]).

As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein displaying the records comprises displaying each of the records as a node in a graph, the displayed attributes of each of the records attributes including one or more of a recordation date, a reception number, and a document type" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1).

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 23 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein displaying the created links comprises displaying the created links as edges in the graph" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein displaying the records comprises displaying the records in a first level of a hierarchical display format" (see Rush et al., Fig. 7).

As to claim 26, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 25 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein displaying the created links comprises for each of the records displayed in the first level, displaying the records linked to the first level record at a nested level lower than the first level" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

As to claim 27, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 25 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein the hierarchical display format comprises a hierarchical tree format" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1 and [column 9, lines 5-10]).

As to claim 35, Morris teaches:

"A system" (see Morris, [0006], [0007], [0018]) comprising:

"logic, to receive a plurality of records, each record having a plurality of attributes

associated with a document recorded with a government entity" (see Morris, [0012], [0018] and

[0034]).

However, Morris does not teach:

"logic to create a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a

document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one

of the records";

"a display mechanism communicatively coupled to the logic, the display mechanism to

display the records and the created links".

On the other hand, Rush et al. teaches:

"logic to create a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a

document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one

of record" (see [column 2, lines 15-30], [column 9, lines 5-10] and Fig. 1 wherein information

related to a document (e.g., document identification [column 3, lines 45-60]) is equivalent to

each record as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [column 6, lines 57-61]); and

"a display mechanism communicatively coupled to the logic, the display mechanism to

displaying the records and created links" (see Fig. 1 and [column 9, lines 5-10] and [column 12,

lines 65-67]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Rush et al. into Morris's system. Skilled

artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Rush et al., Abstract and [column 3,

lines 44-67] to display a set of records in the form of an organization hierarchy and thus provide

an effective way to search and retrieve electronic documents. In addition, both of the references

(Morris and Rush et al.) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to

the same field of endeavor, such as, information retrieval and electronic document management.

This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.


As to claim 36, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein the logic creates organizational links between records associated with

documents having one or more of an assignment relationship, a curing relationship indicating the

first document cures the second document, a corrective relationship indicting the first document

corrects the second document, an amendment relationship indicating the first document amends

the second document, and a mortgage relationship indicating the first document places a

mortgage on a deed associated with the second document" (see Rush et al., [column 3, lines 35-

43] and [column 12, lines 65-67] wherein relationship between document and subdocument as

disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's "assignment link").


As to claim 37, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"creating a sentinel link from one of the records to an indicator of an organizational

property associated with the record" (see Rush et al., [column 3, lines 45-67], [column 4, lines

15-30] and Fig. 7 wherein link between document instance node (document or record) and

document type node (organization property) in the hierarchical tree structure is equivalent to

Applicant's "sentinel link").

As to claim 38, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

37 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein the logic creates the sentinel link for one of a record used as a starting point for

a title search, a record associated with a good stop document for the title search, a record

associated with a non-cured lien document, and a record associated with a document which may

cloud ownership of a property" (see Rush et al., [column 11, lines 35-67], [column 12, lines 1-

25] and Fig. 7-8 wherein entry point is equivalent to Applicant's "starting point" and link to node

"Customers" or "Sales Orders" are example of sentinel link for a starting point).

As to claim 39, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein the display mechanism displays the records as node in a graph and displays the

links as edges in the graph" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

As to claim 40, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein the display mechanism displays the records in a first level of a hierarchical

display format and displays the records linked to the first level records in a nested level lower

than the first level" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

As to claim 41, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein the display mechanism displays the records in color-coded format, the color

indicating an organizational category of the document associated with the record" (see Rush et

al., [column 23, lines 5-15] wherein using various icon to visually symbolize different types of

documents is equivalent to color-coded format as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 42, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

41 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. teach:

"wherein the organizational categories include one or more of non-cured documents,

possibly cured documents, documents which may cloud title to a property, cured lien document,

cured documents releasing a non-returned lien document, and good stop document for a title

search" (see Rush et al., [column 10, lines 1-10], [column 23, lines 5-55] and Fig. 1).

10.    Claim 15 (effective filing date 3/18/2004) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over <u>Morris</u> (US Publication No 2004/0024605, effective filing date 12/4/2002) in

view of <u>Rush et al.</u> (US Patent No 7,131,069, effective filing date 10/22/1998), and further in

view of <u>Fries</u> (US Publication No 2003/0036922, effective filing date 8/15/2002).


As to claim 15, <u>Morris</u> teaches:

"A computerized method for organizing and displaying documents for a title

examination" (see <u>Morris,</u> [0006], [0007], [0018]) the method comprising:

"receiving a plurality of records, each record having a plurality of attributes associated       ·

with a document recorded with a government entity" (see <u>Morris,</u> [0012], [0018] and [0034]).

However, <u>Morris</u> does not teach:

"creating a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a

document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one

of the records";

"creating a sentinel link from one of the records to an indicator of an organizational

property associated with the one of the records"

"determining the one of the records is associated with a good stop document, the one of

the records being a good stop for a title search";

"creating a link from the one of the records to a good stop indicator";

"displaying the records"; and

"displaying the created links between the records".

On the other hand, <u>Rush et al.</u> teaches:

"creating a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one of record" (see Rush et al., Abstract and [column 9, lines 5-10]);

"creating a sentinel link from one of the records to an indicator of an organizational property associated with the record" (see Rush et al., [column 3, lines 45-67], [column 4, lines 15-30] and Fig. 7 wherein link between document instance node (document or record) and document type node (organization property) in the hierarchical tree structure is equivalent to Applicant's "sentinel link"), wherein creating the sentinel link comprises:

"determining the one of the records is associated with a good stop document, the one of the records being a good stop for a title search" (see Rush et al., [column 11, lines 40-55] and [column 12, lines 1-10] for designating some documents as entry points);

"creating a link from the one of the records to a good stop indicator" (see Rush et al., Fig. 7 and Fig. 8 wherein each document type node represents a good stop indicator).

"displaying the records" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1); and

"displaying the created links between the records (see Rush et al., Fig. 1 and [column 9, lines 5-10] and [column 12, lines 65-67]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Rush et al. into Morris's system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Rush et al., Abstract and [column 3, lines 44-67] to display a set of records in the form of an organization hierarchy and thus provide an effective way to search and retrieve electronic documents. In addition, both of the references (Morris and Rush et al.) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to

the same field of endeavor, such as, information retrieval and electronic document management. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

However, Morris and Rush et al. do not teach:

"determining the one of the records is associated with a deed document having a subdivision developer grantor".

On the other hand, Fries teaches:

"determining the one of the records is associated with a deed document having a subdivision developer grantor" (see Fries, [0027] wherein grantor information provides information to determine if a deed document having a specific grantor).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Fries into Morris's system (as modified by Rush et al.). Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective way to manage the title search for title examination. In addition, both of the references (Morris and Rush et al.) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, search and examination of a property title, documents (e.g., liens, deeds, mortgages) related to the title of a real estate property. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

11.    Claims 28-34 (effective filing date 3/18/2004) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (US Publication No 2004/0024605) in view of Rush et al. (US Patent No 7,131,069), and further in view of Woodings et al. (Publication No US 2004/0267595).

As to claim 28, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris and Rush et al. do not teach:

"wherein displaying the records comprises displaying the records in color-coded format,

the color indicating an organizational category of the document associated with the record".

Woodings et al. teaches color coding various user interface representations (see [0142]

and [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Woodings et al. into the Morris's system (as

modified by Rush et al.). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so as

suggested by Woodings et al. (see [0142]) to use color coding in order to provide an effective

way to display, view and recognize information in presentations on a graphical user interface.


As to claim 29, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

28 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris, Rush et al. and Woodings et al. teach:

"wherein the organizational categories include one or more of non-cured documents,

possibly cured documents, documents which may cloud title to a property, cured lien document,

cured documents releasing a non-returned lien document, and good-stop document for a title

search" (see Morris, [0035] for different types of real estate transaction forms, Rush et al.,

[column 10, lines 1-10], [column 23, lines 5-55] and Fig 1 for different categories in a

hierarchy).

As to claim 30, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

28 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris, Rush et al. and Woodings et al. teach:

"wherein the records are received from search logic using an initial one of the records as

a starting point for the search, the method further comprising color-coding the initial record to

indicate the record is the starting record" (see Rush et al., [column 11, lines 37-55], [column 21,

lines 20-35] and [column 23, lines 60-65] for using icons or distinct graphics to recognize

different type of objects in the hierarchy; and see Woodings et al., [0142] for color coding).

As to claim 31, Morris teaches:

"A computerized method for organizing and displaying documents for a title

examination" (see Morris, [0006], [0007], [0018]) the method comprising:

"receiving a plurality of records, each record having a plurality of attributes associated

with a document recorded with a government entity" (see Morris, [0012], [0018] and [0034]).

However, Morris does not teach:

"creating curing links, each curing link defining a curing relationship between one of the

records associated with a lien document to a second one of the records associated a cure

document that releases a lien represented by lien document";

"creating one or more sentinel links, each sentinel link associating one of the records to

an indicator of an organizational property associated with the record";

"the displayed attributes of the records including a recordation date, a reception number,

and a document category"; and

"displaying the created links between the records".

On the other hand, Rush et al. teaches:

"creating curing links, each curing link defining a curing relationship between one of the

records associated with a lien document to a second one of the records associated a cure

document that releases the lien" (see Morris, [0018] for lien record associated with lien and

release instrument (cure document) which release the lien; see Rush et al., [column 8, lines 25-

30] wherein relationship (linked by unique AP invoice identifier) between Accounts Payable

Invoice document (charge) and Accounts Payable Payment document (payment) can be

interpreted "curing link" since the payment document releases or cures the invoice document);

"creating one or more sentinel links, each sentinel link associating one of the records to

an indicator of an organizational property associated with the record" (see Rush et al., [column 3,

lines 45-67], [column 4, lines 15-30] and Fig. 7 wherein link between document instance node

(document or record) and document type node (organization property) in the hierarchical tree

structure is interpreted as sentinel link);

"the displayed attributes of the records including a recordation date, a reception number,

and a document category" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1 and [column 3, lines 45-60]; and

"displaying the created links between the records (see Rush et al., Fig. 1 and [column 9,

lines 5-10] and [column 12, lines 65-67]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Rush et al. into Morris's system. Skilled

artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Rush et al., Abstract and [column 3,

lines 44-67] to display a set of records in the form of an organization hierarchy and thus provide

an effective way to search and retrieve electronic documents. In addition, both of the references

(Morris and Rush et al.) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to

the same field of endeavor, such as, information retrieval and electronic document management.

This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

However, Morris and Rush et al. do not teach:

"color coding the records with a color indicating a category of the record"; and

"displaying the records using the color code".

Woodings et al. teaches color coding various user interface representations (see [0142]

and [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Woodings et al. into the Morris's system (as

modified by Rush et al.). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so as

suggested by Woodings et al. (see [0142]) to use color coding in order to provide an effective

way to display, view and recognize information in presentations on a graphical user interface.


As to claim 32, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

31 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris, Rush et al. and Woodings et al. teach:

" wherein creating a sentinel link comprises creating a link from a record to an indicator

indicating one of a starting search indicator, a good stop indicator, and a non-cured indicator"

(see Rush et al., [column 11, lines 35-67], [column 12, lines 1-25] and Fig. 7-8 wherein entry

point is equivalent to Applicant's "starting point" and link to node "Customers" or "Sales

Orders" are example of sentinel link to starting search indicator).


As to claim 33, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

31 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris, Rush et al. and Woodings et al. teach:

"wherein displaying the records comprises displaying each of the records as a node in a

graph and wherein displaying the created links comprises displaying the links as edges in the

graph" (see Rush et al., Fig. 1, [column 3, lines 45-60] and [column 20, lines 25-35]).


As to claim 34, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

31 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Morris, Rush et al. and Woodings et al. teach:

"wherein displaying the records comprises displaying each record in a first hierarchical

level and wherein displaying the created links comprises for each of the records displayed in the

first level, displaying the records linked to the first level record at a nested level lower than the

first level" (see Rush et al., Fig. 7 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**CHARLES RONES**
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Phuong-Thao Cao
Art Unit 2164
August 21, 2007